



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,177	05/30/2000	Bijendra N Jain	M-7915US	5355

33031 7590 05/31/2005

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP  
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.  
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201  
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/583,177

Applicant(s)

JAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Christian La Forgia

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-30,32-36,38-43,45-49 and 51-59 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-30,32-36,38-43,45-49 and 51-59 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

nd

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment of 14 March 2005 has been noted and made of record.
2. Claims 27-30, 32-36, 38-43, 45-49, and 51-59 have been presented for examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 14 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).
5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the references themselves provide motivation or a suggestion to combine the reference.
6. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, such as the independent and non-independent rows being interpreted in light of their algebraic definitions, are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

7. See further rejections that follow.

### ***Claim Rejections***

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 27-30, 32-36, 38-43, 45-49, and 51-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,553 to Claffery et al., hereinafter Claffery, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,596,719 to Ramakrishnan et al., hereinafter Ramakrishnan, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,103 to Henderson et al., hereinafter Henderson, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,171 to LaFollette et al., hereinafter LaFollette.

10. As per claims 27, 40, and 53, Claffery teaches a computer system comprising:  
generating a first matrix from the first set of network element pairs (Figure 1 [block 10]; column 5, line 58 to column 6, line 15; column 8, lines 15-20), wherein  
each row in the first matrix corresponds to a corresponding network element pair in the first set of network element pairs (Figure 1 [block 10]; column 5, line 58 to column 6, line 15; column 8, lines 15-20), and  
form a second set of network element pairs (Figure 1 [block 16]; column 6, lines 22-54),  
wherein

the second set of network element pairs contains independent network element pairs in the first set of network element pairs (column 8, lines 26-33), and

each one of the independent pairs of network element corresponds to a one of the independent rows of the first matrix (column 8, lines 15-20; column 8, lines 26-33);

11. Claffery does not disclose identifying pairs of the network elements as being in a first set of network element pairs, said first matrix comprises independent rows and non-independent rows, measuring a measured network performance metric between a first network element and a second network element of each network element pair in the second set of network element pairs, and computing a computed network performance metric between a first network element and a second network element of a remaining network element pair in the first set of network element pairs using at least one of the measured network performance metrics, wherein the remaining network element pair corresponds to a non-independent row of the first matrix.

12. Ramakrishnan discloses identifying pairs of the network elements as being in a first set of network element pairs (Figure 3, column 1, lines 57-65, column 8, lines 15-43).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify pairs of the network elements as being in a first set of network element pairs, since it has been held that substituting equivalents known for the same purpose requires only routine skill in the art. See MPEP § 2144.06; see also *Smith v. Hayashi*, 209 USPQ 754 (Bd. of Pat. Inter. 1980), which held that two items that are known to have the same function in the art presents strong evidence in substituting one for the other. In this case, identifying pairs of network elements and identifying links are both known and used in the art for determining the shortest path through a network.

14. Henderson teaches wherein the first matrix comprises independent rows and non-independent rows (Figures 5c and 5d; column 14, lines 9-56). Wherein the independent rows are

Art Unit: 2131

drawn to connection numbers 511, 513, 514, 516-519, and 522 and the non-independent rows are drawn to connection numbers 512, 515, 520, and 521.

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have first matrix comprise of independent and non-independent rows, since it has been held in *Claffery* in column 18 that such a modification would aid in measuring performance metrics between adjacent nodes and computing performance metrics for nodes that have an intervening node.

16. LaFollette discloses measuring a measured network performance metric between a first network element and a second network element of each network element pair in the second set of network element pairs (Figure 4 [blocks 402, 406], column 5, lines 3-17, column 6, lines 47-67); and

computing a computed network performance metric between a first network element and a second network element of a remaining network element pair in the first set of network element pairs using at least one of the measured network performance metrics, wherein the remaining network element pair corresponds to a non-independent row of the first matrix (column 5, lines 3-17, column 6, lines 47-67, column 8, lines 7-19).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the measuring and computing steps, since LaFollette states at column 6, lines 26-40 that such a modification would provide an accurate measure since the measure node is not on the path that connects the network element pairs.

Art Unit: 2131

18. Regarding claims 28 and 41, Claffery teaches wherein the first set of network element pairs is a requirements set (Figure 1 [block 10]; column 5, line 58 to column 6, line 16; column 8, lines 15-20).

19. With regards to claims 29 and 42, Claffery teaches wherein the second set of network element pairs is a measurements set (Figure 1 [block 16]; column 6, lines 22-29).

20. Concerning claims 30, 39, 43, and 52, Claffery teaches wherein each one of the network elements is a router (column 5, lines 40-58).

21. Regarding claims 32, 45, and 54, Claffery teaches wherein the computer code is further configured to cause the processor to compute a number, wherein the number is equal to a rank of the first matrix (column 4, lines 31-44);

determine if a first the number of rows of the first matrix are independent (Figure 1 [block 12]; column 4, lines 31-44; column 8, lines 21-25); and

if the first the number of the rows of the first matrix are not independent, re-arrange the rows of the first matrix such that the first the number of the rows of the first matrix are independent (Figure 1 [block 12]; column 4, lines 31-44; column 8, lines 21-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compute a number that is equaled to the rank of the first matrix. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to rank the matrices as it serves as a way to rank those network elements which

Art Unit: 2131

provide a connection between the source and destination nodes while eliminating those matrices that do not provide a path between the source and destination nodes.

22. Concerning claims 33, 46, and 55, Claffery teaches wherein the computer code is further configured to cause the processor to identify a maximal set of independent rows of the first matrix based on the number (Figure 1 [block 12]; column 4, lines 31-44; column 8, lines 21-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compute a number that is equaled to the rank of the first matrix. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to rank the matrices as it serves as a way to rank those network elements which provide a connection between the source and destination nodes while eliminating those matrices that do not provide a path between the source and destination nodes.

23. With regards to claims 34, 47, and 56, Claffery teaches wherein the computer code configured to cause the processor to re-arrange the rows of the first matrix such that the first the number of the rows of the first matrix are independent, if the first the number of the rows of the first matrix are not independent, is further configured to cause the processor to re-arrange the pairs of the network elements in the first set of network element pairs such that the correspondence between each row of the first matrix and the corresponding network element pair in the first set of network element pairs is maintained (Figure 1 [block 12]; column 4, lines 31-44; column 8, lines 21-25).



Art Unit: 2131

24. Regarding claims 35, 48, and 57, Claffery teaches wherein the computer code configured to cause the processor to form the second set of network element pairs is configured to cause the processor to copy a first the number of pairs of the network elements in the first set of network element pairs into the second set of network element pairs (column 6, lines 22-29).

25. Regarding claims 36, 49, and 58, Claffery teaches wherein the computer code configured to cause the processor to compute the computed network performance metric between the first network element and the second network element of the remaining network element pair is configured to cause the processor to:

form a second matrix (Figure 1 [block 16]; column 6, lines 22-29; column 8, lines 26-33), wherein

each row of the second matrix corresponds to a corresponding one of the non-independent rows of the first matrix (column 8, lines 26-33), and

the each row of the second matrix is such that the corresponding one of the non-independent rows of the first matrix can be expressed in terms of the independent rows using the each row of the second matrix (column 8, lines 26-33);

organize the measured network performance metrics into a vector (Figures 1 [block 18], 2; column 8, line 43 to column 9, line 16); and

compute the computed network performance metric between the first network element and the second network element of the remaining network element pair by multiplying the vector by a row of the second matrix corresponding to the remaining network element pair (Figures 1 [block 18], 2; column 8, line 43 to column 9, line 16; column 9, lines 22-53).

Art Unit: 2131

26. Regarding claims 38, 51, and 59, Claffery teaches wherein the computer code configured to cause the processor to compute the computed network performance metric between the first network element and the second network element of the remaining network element pair is further configured to configured to cause the processor to create a vector equivalent to the non-independent row of the first matrix by combining a plurality of the independent rows of the first matrix (Figures 1 [block 18], 2; column 8, line 43 to column 9, line 16; column 9, lines 22-53); and

compute the computed network performance metric by combining a measured network performance metric of each network element pair of the second set of network element pairs corresponding to one of the plurality of the independent rows of the first matrix (Figures 1 [block 18], 2; column 8, line 43 to column 9, line 16; column 9, lines 22-53).

### *Conclusion*

27. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

28. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2131

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

31. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2131  
clf

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100